



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/565,773	08/17/2006	Otto Erik Sielcken	4662-135	3000

23117 7590 12/14/2007
NIXON & VANDERHYE, PC
901 NORTH GLEBE ROAD, 11TH FLOOR
ARLINGTON, VA 22203

EXAMINER

CUTLIFF, YATE KAI RENE

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
----------	--------------

1621

MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
-----------	---------------

12/14/2007

PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Office Action Summary	Application No. 10/565,773	Applicant(s) SIELCKEN ET AL.	
	Examiner Yate' K. Cutliff	Art Unit 1621	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 25 January 2006.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-20 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-9 and 16-20 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☒ Claim(s) 10- 15 is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☒ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☒ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☒ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- | | |
|------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| 1) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application |
| 3) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date <u>1/25/2006</u> . | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____ |

DETAILED ACTION

Specification

1. The disclosure is objected to because of the following informalities: The application contains Figs. 1 and 2. The figures are not referenced in the Specification. When drawings are included, there shall be a brief description of the several views of the drawings. 37 CFR 1.74.

Appropriate correction is required.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

2. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

3. The factual inquiries set forth in *Graham v. John Deere Co.*, 383 U.S. 1, 148 USPQ 459 (1966), that are applied for establishing a background for determining obviousness under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) are summarized as follows:

1. Determining the scope and contents of the prior art.
2. Ascertaining the differences between the prior art and the claims at issue.
3. Resolving the level of ordinary skill in the pertinent art.
4. Considering objective evidence present in the application indicating obviousness or nonobviousness.

4. This application currently names joint inventors. In considering patentability of the claims under 35 U.S.C. 103(a), the examiner presumes that the subject matter of the various claims was commonly owned at the time any inventions covered therein

were made absent any evidence to the contrary. Applicant is advised of the obligation under 37 CFR 1.56 to point out the inventor and invention dates of each claim that was not commonly owned at the time a later invention was made in order for the examiner to consider the applicability of 35 U.S.C. 103(c) and potential 35 U.S.C. 102(e), (f) or (g) prior art under 35 U.S.C. 103(a).

5. Claims 1 - 8 and 16-20 rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Sielcken et al. (U.S. 5,495,041) and Drent et al. (WO 02/26690).

The rejected claims, inter alia, are drawn to a process for the carbonylation of a conjugated diene by reacting the conjugated diene with carbon monoxide and a hydroxyl group-containing compound in the presence of a palladium catalyst system in a reaction zone to produce a reaction mixture, said catalyst system comprising (a) a source of palladium cations, (b) a mono-, bi- or multidentate phosphine ligand, containing at least one phosphorus atom which is directly bound to two or three aliphatic carbon atoms, as process ligand to produce a palladium-phosphine ligand complex catalyst, and (c) a source of anions, said process ligand (b) containing the moiety shown in formula (1).

Sielcken et al. teaches a process for the preparation of pentenoate ester by carbonylation of butadiene or butadiene derivative in the presence of carbon monoxide, an alcohol, a catalyst system comprising palladium, a carboxylic acid and a monodentate or multidentate phosphine ligand. (see Example I and columns 2-4, 6-8).

Sielcken et al. fails to explicitly disclose the use of a bi-dentate phosphine ligand; monitoring of the concentration and degradation rate of the process ligand; 1, 3-butadiene; and carboxylic acids such as pivalic acid, monomethyladipate, acetic acid.

Drent et al. discloses a process for the carbonylation of a conjugated diene that has a catalyst system which includes a diphosphine ligand, the conjugated diene can be 1,3 butadiene and the carboxylic acids such a pivalic, monomethyladipate and acetic. (see pages 6, 7 and 11). With regard to monitoring of the concentration and degradation rate of the process ligand, Drent et al. discloses that its process has the advantage of catalyst system stability over a prolonged period of time. This statement in the specification on page 2 is an indication that in the process of Drent et al. the ligand is being monitored during the carbonylation process, as such, the addition of more ligand during process would be will within the purview of the ordinarily artisan desiring to tweak the process.

It would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art to choose a catalyst system including mono-, bi- or multidentate phosphine ligand of formula (1) with X, A1 and A2 as defined in view of the catalyst systems taught by Sielcken et al and Drent et al. with the predictable result for carbonylation of a conjugated diene as taught by Sielcken et al and Drent et al..

Therefore, the invention as a whole was *prima facie* obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made, as evidenced by the references, especially in the absence of evidence to the contrary.

Allowable Subject Matter

6. Claims 10 – 15 are objected to as being dependent upon a rejected base claim, but would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims.

7. The following is a statement of reasons for the indication of allowable subject matter: Applicant has discovered a novel and unobvious process for carbonylation of conjugated diene with the additional reaction step of feeding a second phosphine ligand different from the process ligand into the reaction process.

Conclusion

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Yate' K. Cutliff whose telephone number is (571) 272-9067. The examiner can normally be reached on M-TH 8:30 a.m. - 5:00 p.m..


If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Yvonne Eyler can be reached on (571) 272 - 0871. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Application/Control Number:
10/565,773
Art Unit: 1621

Page 6

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

Yaté K. Cutliff
Patent Examiner
Group Art Unit 1621
Technology Center 1600



Samuel Barts
Primary Examiner
Art Unit 1600